February 2, 2009

TO: Teresa Parsons,
           Director's Review Program Supervisor

FROM   Meredith Huff, SPHR
           Director's Review Investigator

SUBJECT: Michael Gilbreath v. Washington State University (WSU)
           Allocation Review No. ALLO 08-004

Directors Review Conference
Michael Gilbreath requested a Director's Review of his position's allocation by submitting a
Request for Director's Review form on January 17, 2008. On December 16, 2008, I conducted
a Director's review conference by phone. Present by phone were Michael Gilbreath and Ms.
Kimberly Maupin, Human Resource Consultant, representing WSU. The timeframe for this
review is the six months prior to October 11, 2007, the submittal date of the initial WSU Position
Questionnaire (PQ).

Director's Determination
The Director's review of WSU's allocation determination of Mr. Gilbreath's position is complete.
The review was based on written documentation and classifications and the information
obtained during the review conference. As the Director's investigator, I have carefully reviewed
all of the information. I conclude that on a best fit of overall duties and responsibilities, Mr.
Gilbreath's position is properly allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 2
classification.

Background
On October 11, 2007, the WSU Human Resources office received Mr. Gilbreath's completed
WSU Position Questionnaire (PQ). Mr. Gilbreath's position was allocated to the Information
Technology Specialist 2 class. Mr. Gilbreath indicated he believed his position should be
reallocated to the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification. The supervisor's review
section of the PQ is signed by John Chapman. (Exhibit A-4)

By letter dated December 18, 2007, Rich Heath, Senior Associate Vice President for Business &
Finance and Theresa Eliot-Cheslek, Associate Director of Human Resources Services, jointly

issued an allocation determination indicating Mr. Gilbreath's position was appropriately allocated to the Information Technology Specialist 2 classification and his request for reallocation to the Information Technology Specialist 3 class was denied.

Mr. Gilbreath requested a Director's Review of the findings by submitting a Director's Review Request Form on January 17, 2008. Mr. Gilbreath also submitted a revised Position Questionnaire signed and dated January 17, 2008.

Mr. Gilbreath's comments
Mr. Gilbreath works in the Information Technology Services at Washington State University. His current classification is Information Technology Specialist 2 (ITS2).

On the PQ, Mr. Gilbreath indicated that his work is "conducted under general direction. I am required to independently apply my analysis, design, and technical programming skills to complete various application programming projects over many Mainframe system areas. My assigned projects require me to use ADABAS, NATURAL, DCF, FORMPORT, COBOL, and various systems and software in the batch JCL environment. Projects documentation and problem resolution documentation are also required."(Exhibit B-7)

During the review conference, Mr. Gilbreath described how his unit is organized and work is assigned. He noted that a compass group, which includes his supervisor, determines the projects and project priority for the unit. He further explained that the leadership team, including his supervisor, then hands out projects and priority assignments to staff making sure that there is no conflict between two or more campus computer systems as a result of the assignments. Once a project is completed, Mr. Gilbreath confirmed that it is submitted back to the supervisor who checks it, verifies that it works, and then signs off on it.

Mr. Gilbreath indicated that he participates on a rotational team and every five weeks occupies an on-call "hotseat" during nights, weekends and holidays for the Business Systems Support. The calls may come from Business Systems, ARMs, payroll or other campus areas. When he is not the lead programmer for the caller, he contacts another programmer to fix the problem. He observed that normally an on-call problem is a system level problem such as program failure or program not updating.

Mr. Gilbreath indicated that he was the lead for the upgrade and maintenance of the library mainframe system. He stated he provides IT services to the part of the library system that provides users' services, including fines and billings and the tie from the library to accounting. He stated that a majority of his work with library staff is for patron level problems, such as someone's name is not in the system. Mr. Gilbreath indicated he does not work with other Library programs such as the circulation system.

Mr. Gilbreath emphasized some of his projects apply to multiple offices. He gave an example of the Accounting Codebook conversion which applied to multiple offices and involved updating programs which resulted in better reports for the Comptroller's Office. He stated he was responsible for the programming. Mr. Gilbreath indicated that he drafted a detailed analysis of how to test and effectively develop the changes. He stressed that he worked with others for the

testing process to prevent problems with other systems. Mr. Gilbreath depicted this project as public in nature and far reaching as it affected all Accounting and Comptroller programs.

Mr. Gilbreath emphasized that as a security and integrity precaution, the supervisors review all programmers' work prior to it being implemented. Mr. Gilbreath stressed the he did not consider anything that he does as being straightforward. WSU computer programs are integrated so there are other systems to consider, there are business needs to meet and deadlines to observe. He completes needs assessments for projects to analyze any changes since the last report, determine the usefulness of changes and to test.

Mr. Gilbreath stated he did not find any exceptions to Ms. Maupin's overall assessment. He commented he felt it was difficult to apply definitions of complexity if a person did not have a programming background. He emphasized that everything [WSU computer systems] is interrelated and there can be vast impacts without coordination. Mr. Gilbreath stated that prior to assignments being put into production, WSU policy requires supervisory approval in order to assess project impact. Mr. Gilbreath indicated he does not believe this policy is in conflict with the descriptions of the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification, which he feels is the best class for his position.

WSU Comments
Ms. Maupin described her review process. She noted that after reviewing the PQ, she believed there were some conflicts in terms of his working independently and working under general direction of the supervisor. Ms. Maupin stated that she and Ms. Sabrina McPherson, Human Resource Consultant, met with Mr. Gilbreath to clarify information from his position questionnaire.

Ms. Maupin also verified information about Mr. Gilbreath's responsibilities with his immediate supervisor, Mr. Jay Maylor, Application Systems Analyst/ Developer and his second level supervisor, Mr. John Chapman. She indicated that Mr. Gilbreath's work priorities and deadlines are set by his supervisor. She confirmed that during Mr. Gilbreath's "hot seat" coverage, he handles the routine issues; the more complex issues that arise go to higher level computer staff. Ms. Maupin reported the Mr. Maylor described most of Mr. Gilbreath's tasks and assignments as routine or standard and specified that Mr. Gilbreath's work is reviewed prior to receiving the supervisor's final approval.

Following the discussions with Mr. Gilbreath, Mr. Maylor and Mr. Chapman, Ms. Maupin stated that she determined that Mr. Gilbreath worked under *general supervision* rather than *general direction*. For routine and straightforward tasks, Ms. Maupin confirmed that Mr. Gilbreath worked with minimum supervision. She confirmed that Mr. Gilbreath worked with his supervisor to develop a work plan for complex projects; Mr. Gilbreath reviewed any potential changes to the work plan with the supervisor. Ms. Maupin pointed out that her findings supported the Information Technology Specialist 2 class as the best fit for Mr. Gilbreath's overall duties and responsibilities.

Rationale for Director's Determination
A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which the work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

The Personnel Resources Board (PRB) has held the following:
> . . . because a current and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities as documented in the classification questionnaire. Lawrence v. Dept of Social and Health Services, PAB No. ALLO-99-0027 (2000).

In Salsberry v. Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-06-013 (2007), the Personnel Resources Board addressed the concept of best fit. The Board referenced Allegri v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998), in which the Personnel Appeals Board noted that while the appellant's duties and responsibilities did not encompass the full breadth of the duties and responsibilities described by the classification to which his position was allocated, on a best fit basis, the classification best described the level, scope and diversity of the overall duties and responsibilities of his position.

Glossary of Classification Terms
In reviewing this position, I have considered the following terms. The Department of Personnel's Glossary of Classification Terms defines these terms. The Glossary is found at http://www.dop.wa.gov/HRProfessionals/Classification/.

Complexity of work – Refers to the scope, variety and difficulty of the duties, responsibilities and skills required in order to perform the work. Complexity may be categorized as follows [in part]:
> 2. Routine – Involves the performance of several related and repetitive tasks, which require some judgment in respect to the rules, procedures, materials, or equipment that, will be used.
> 3. Complex – Requires the use of a wide variety of rules, processes, materials, or equipment that require an application of specialized knowledge or skills. Decisions must be made independently regarding which rules, processes, materials or equipment to use in order to effectively accomplish work assignments.

Independent – Has the authority to make decisions without supervisory approval regarding the work processes and methods which will be used; can modify procedures as long as such changes conform to agency/institutional and departmental policies and regulations.

Supervision required – The extent of control exercised by the supervisor with respect to the way assignments are made; the latitude that the position incumbent has in performing

and/or determining work methods and priorities; the scope of decision-making authority that the position incumbent has to use discretion in determining a course of action in new or unusual situations; and the degree of review of completed assignments. There are four basic types of supervision [in part]:

1. Direct supervision – Work is performed in accordance with specific instructions regarding assignments to be completed and sequence of work steps to be employed. Decision-making authority is limited to clearly defined work procedures, formats and priorities. Work is reviewed for accuracy, and adherence to instructions and established procedures.
2. General supervision – Recurring assignments are carried out within established guidelines without specific instruction. Deviation from normal policies, procedures, and work methods requires supervisory approval, and supervisory guidance is provided in new or unusual situations. The employee's work is periodically reviewed to verify compliance with policies and procedures.
3. General direction – Work assignments are carried out in accordance with established policies and objectives. Position incumbents plan and organize the work, determine the work methods to be employed, and assist in determining priorities and deadlines. Completed work is reviewed in terms of effectiveness in producing expected results.

Information Technology Specialist 1 (ITS1) (Class code 479I)
The class series concept is found on the ITS 1 class. The Information Technology Specialist classifications are broadly written and encompass a wide variety of positions that perform professional information technology systems and/or applications functions. It is undisputed that Mr. Gilbreath's position fits within the series concept for this classification series.

Information Technology Specialist 3 (ITS3) (Class code 479K)
The **Definition** of the ITS3 states, in part**:** *"In support of information systems and users in an assigned area of responsibility, independently performs consulting, designing, programming, installation, maintenance, quality assurance, troubleshooting and/or technical support for applications, hardware and software products, databases, database management systems, support products, network infrastructure equipment, or telecommunications infrastructure, software or hardware... The majority of assignments and projects are moderate in size and impact an agency division or large workgroup or single business function; or internal or satellite operations, multiple users, or more than one group. Consults with higher-level technical staff to resolve complex problems."*

The information in Mr. Gilbreath's Position Description and other documents, indicates Mr. Gilbreath does programming to support, monitor and enhance a portion of the existing Library computer system, specifically updating library patrons' names in the billing system for fines He does programming to enhance the operations of the Comptroller's office. While filling in his rotation on the weekend/evening "hot seat", Mr. Gilbreath will respond to routine calls for assistance and will forward complex calls/situations to higher level employees. Mr. Gilbreath does programming projects as assigned by his supervisor.

The information provided on the PQ and during the review conference indicates that Mr. Gilbreath's work is assigned and checked by his supervisor and is standard or routine in nature.

Mr. Gilbreath is the primary contact for the portion of the Library system that contains the billing system but is not responsible for all of the Library's computer systems. To complete assigned projects, Mr. Gilbreath creates a work plan which is reviewed and approved by his supervisor; the supervisor also reviews and approves any changes to the work plan. The level of supervision provided to Mr. Gilbreath's position is greater than anticipated in the definition of *independent* provided in the Glossary of Terms and required in the Definition of this class. Mr. Gilbreath's position does not have the level of independence, scope or impact encompassed by the Definition of the Information Technology Specialist 3 classification. The ITS3 class is not the best fit for the overall duties and responsibilities of Mr. Gilbreath's position.

Information Technology Specialist 2 (ITS2) (Class code 479J)
The **Definition** of the ITS2 states, in part: *"In support of information systems and users, performs standard consulting, analyzing, programming, maintenance, installation and/or technical support. Under general supervision, follows established work methods and procedures to complete tasks on computers . . . or databases for small scale systems or programs .or pieces of larger systems or programs. Performs standard tasks such as consulting with customers to identify and analyze technology needs and problems; responding to and resolving trouble reports from users; . . analyzing problems for parts of applications and solving problems with some assistance; supporting and enhancing existing applications in compliance with specifications and standards; conducting unit, system or usability testing; . . . or serving as part of a problem solving team addressing more complex issues. The majority of tasks are limited in scope and impact individuals or small groups. Complex problems are referred to a higher level."*

In response to the PQ question on supervisory review, Mr. Chapman states, *"Michael is given general requirements and he codes, implements and tests independently. His work is checked on a regular basis."* Mr. Gilbreath states that "office procedure dictates that I create a plan for a solution to the task at hand, create or modify code for the solution, test the solution thoroughly, verify the test data and results, and then provide the solution and data to my supervisor for review prior to placing the new code in production." The level of general supervision, independence in work processes such as coding, implementing and testing, and the impact of work responsibilities of Mr. Gilbreath's position is consistent with the Definition of the Information Technology Specialist 2.

Although the Typical Work statements are not allocation criteria, they do provide insight into the level of work that is expected in a classification. The Typical Work statements for the ITS2, copied in part below, reflect the duties and responsibilities of Mr. Gilbreath's position as described on the PQ.
• Provides help desk technical support, and/or responds to trouble reports from users and identifies and resolves problems within their control...
• Advises users on the use of systems, hardware, and software; researches product information; . . .
• Applies pre-tested modifications to applications software . . .;

- Supports and enhances existing applications in compliance with specifications and standards. Reviews and re-writes previously-written code to improve and/or adapt code to changes; . . .
- Assists higher-level analysts with larger projects. Assists in developing prototypes; develops preliminary application specifications; codes, tests (unit, system, and regression), and implements application components. Develops and updates documentation; . . .

Mr. Gilbreath's level of supervision and assigned duties and responsibilities overall are best encompassed in the Information Technology Specialist 2 classification. Mr. Gilbreath's position is allocated correctly to the Information Technology Specialist 2.

Appeal Rights
RCW 41.06.170 governs the right to appeal. RCW 41.06.170(4) provides, in relevant part, the following:

> An employee incumbent in a position at the time of its allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or reallocation to . . . the Washington personnel resources board . . .Notice of such appeal must be filed in writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.

The address for the Personnel Resources Board is 2828 Capitol Blvd., P. O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington 98504-0911.

If no further action is taken, the Director's determination becomes final.

Cc: Michael Gilbreath, WSU
       Kimberly Maupin, WSU
       Lisa Skriletz, DOP

Enclosure: List of Exhibits

Exhibit List

A. Filed by employee January 17, 2008:

1. Director's Review Request form dated January 17, 2008
2. Position Questionnaire signed and dated January 17, 2008
3. Position Description signed and dated January 17, 2008
4. Org chart
5. Appeal of Denial of Reclassification Request to DOP from employee dated January 16, 2008 (6 pages)
6. WSU Allocation determination letter dated December 18, 2007
7. 2007 Project list
8. Checklist of Notable Projects
9. ITAS2 chart
10. ITAS3 chart
11. ITAS definition of terms
12. ITS2 Classification specifications, class code 479J
13. ITS3 Classification specifications, class code 479K
14. WSU Position Questionnaire unsigned and undated
15. Checklist of projects—2006
16. WSU webpage

B. E-mail sent to DOP from WSU November 6, 2008 with attached:
1. Memo from Michael Gilbreath to Kimberly Maupin, HR, 10/11/07
2. Blank Position Description with "see attached" note. 2p.
3. Hand-typed Position Description dated Aug 27, 2001. 3p.
4. ITAS I, II & III table. 3p.
5. ITAS I, II & III Definition of Terms. 1p.
6. Handwritten org chart. 1p.
7. Position Questionnaire date-stamped October 11, 2007. 5p.
8. Checklist of Projects – 2006. 2p.
9. WSU webpage. 1p.
10. Signature page, dated October 11, 2007. 1p.